

One possible grouping would be:

Invention 1: Method to identify compounds... (claim 1)

Invention 2: Compound X (claim 2)

Invention 3: Compound Y (claim 3)

Invention 4: Compound Z (claim 4)

10.59 *Example 39: Protein and its Encoding DNA*

Claim 1: Isolated protein X having SEQ ID NO: 1.

Claim 2: Isolated DNA molecule encoding protein X of claim 1.

(Some Authorities presume that a claimed biological molecule is in isolated form and therefore do not require the claim to explicitly include the term "isolated" as above.)

The disclosure teaches that protein X is an interleukin-1, a soluble cytokine involved in the activation of lymphocytes. The disclosure also sets forth a DNA molecule having SEQ ID NO: 2 that encodes SEQ ID NO: 1.

There is no prior art.

The claimed DNA molecule encodes protein X, and therefore protein X and the DNA encoding protein X share a corresponding technical feature. Consequently, the claims have unity of invention (*a priori*).

Because protein X makes a contribution over the prior art, protein X and the DNA encoding protein X share a special technical feature.

If an alternative DNA claim was presented that encompassed a DNA molecule that did not encode protein X, some Authorities might find that the claims did not share the same or corresponding technical feature and therefore lacked unity. Examples of such a claim follow:

Isolated DNA molecule encoding protein X, or a DNA fragment thereof.

Isolated DNA molecule having SEQ ID NO: 2, or DNA molecules which hybridise to SEQ ID NO: 2 under stringent conditions.

If prior art existed teaching either protein X or the DNA encoding protein X, some Authorities might find that the same or corresponding technical feature did not make a contribution over the prior art, that is, was not a special technical feature, and therefore unity was lacking (*a posteriori*).

Process at the International Search Stage

Invitation to Pay Additional Fees

Article 17(3)(a); Rules 16, 40.2, 40.3, 42

10.60 After deciding that lack of unity exists, except in the circumstances described in paragraphs 10.64 and 10.65, the International Searching Authority informs the applicant of the lack of unity of invention by a communication, preceding (but see paragraph 10.61, below) the issuance of the international search report and written opinion of the International Searching Authority, which contains an invitation to pay additional fees (Form PCT/ISA/206). This invitation specifies the reasons (see paragraph 10.63) for which the international application is not considered as complying with the requirement of unity of invention, identifies the separate inventions and indicates the number of additional search fees and the amount to be paid. The International Searching Authority cannot consider the application withdrawn for lack of unity of invention, nor invite the applicant to amend the

EXHIBIT

tabbles

B